

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19 and 21-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 11-13, and 21 have been amended. No claims are cancelled or newly added. Applicant believes that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 11-13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2002/006815 to Yano et al. ("Yano"). This rejection is improper and should be withdrawn because Yano fails to disclose every feature of the claimed invention.

Amended claim 1 recites a display apparatus including a display panel having a first area and a second area, a first light source for illuminating the first area, and a second light source for illuminating the second area. The first area and the second area are capable of displaying variable data in response to an image signal. The display apparatus is selectively operated in a first mode and a second mode. In the first mode, the first area and the second area are illuminated with substantially same brightness, and in the second mode, the second area is visually darker than the first area for conserving power of the display apparatus.

One aspect of the present invention is to provide a display apparatus with multiple light sources, and each light source is independently controlled based on the mode of the display apparatus to conserve power energy. For example, an LCD display apparatus of a mobile phone includes a first area corresponding to a first light source and a second area corresponding to a second light source, wherein the first area is configured to display first data (e.g., general communication information, such as battery status, phone number, communication status, etc.), and the second area is configured to display second data (e.g., image information, such as received images, personalized graphics, texts, etc.). When the mobile phone is in a first mode (e.g., when the first area and the second area together display complicated information), the

first area and the second area may both be illuminated by having both the first and the second light sources in the ON state (e.g., to maximize a brightness level). Therefore, the first area and the second area may be illuminated with substantially the same brightness in the first mode. In addition, when the mobile phone is in a second mode (e.g., standby mode), the first light source can be in ON state, while the second light source can be in an OFF state or an ON state of lower brightness level (e.g., to conserve power). Therefore, when the device is in the second mode, the second area may be visually darker than the first area.

In contrast, Yano discloses a liquid crystal display device, which sequentially lights a plurality of fluorescent tubes to eliminate animation blur caused by a moving image. In other words, Yano eliminates animation blur so that differences in brightness shown on the display panel cannot be visually recognized by a naked eye. The plurality of fluorescent tubes are successively turned on in accordance with the scanning timing generated by the timing generating section (i.e., two adjacent tubes cannot be turned on simultaneously). In other words, the state of one tube is dependent on the state of its adjacent tube, and as such, Yano does not disclose that two tubes can be turned on simultaneously, but rather, only one tube can be turned on at a time. Therefore, Yano does not teach at least the feature of claim 1 where different areas illuminated by different light sources may have substantially same brightness in one mode and visually different brightness levels in another mode.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Yano does not disclose every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11 and 21 include similar features as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, and 22 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 11, and 21. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims are likewise improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,657,004 to Whittaker et

al. ("Whittaker") in view US Patent No. 6,657,640 to Shigeta ("Shigeta"). Applicants traverse this rejection because Whittaker and Shigeta, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest every feature of the claimed invention.

Whittaker discloses an electronic display device that provides an audio display coordinated with a changing visual display. As described in column 3, line 43 - column 4, line 12, the electronic display has a first light source for illuminating a first transparency area and a second light source for illuminating a second transparency area. During a first audio segment, the first light source is ON and the the second light source is OFF, and during a second audio segment, the first light source is OFF and the second light source turns ON. In other words, the light sources of Whittaker are turned on in sequence, where two adjacent transparencies cannot be turned on simultaneously to have substantially same brightness.

Shigeta fails to cure the deficiencies of Whittaker discussed above. Therefore, Whittaker and Shigeta, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a display apparatus capable of controlling light sources independently, such as driving two light sources to generate substantially same brightness light in a first mode, or driving one light source to generate light with darker brightness than another light source in a second mode.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 21 are improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 6-9 and 12-13 depend from and add features to one of Claims 1, 11 and 21. Therefore, the rejection of this claim is likewise improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whittaker in view of Shigeta and further view of US Patent No. 5,619,351 to Funamoto et al. ("Funamoto"). Funamoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Whittaker discussed above with respect to claim 21. Claim 22 depends from and adds features to claim 21. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 is improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: December 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rick A. Toering
Registration No. 43,195

CUSTOMER NO.
00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Fax: 703-770-7901